

1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 FOR THE DISTRICT OF PUERTO RICO
3

4 MANUEL ALVAREZ

5 Plaintiff

6 v.

7 MICHAEL J. ASTRE, COMMISSIONER
8 SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION
9 ET AL

Defendants

10
11 Civil No. 08-1813 (SEC)

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
OPINION AND ORDER

20 On July 24, 2008, Manuel Alvarez (“Plaintiff”) filed the instant complaint against
21 Michael J. Astre, Commissioner of the Social Security Administration, among other defendants,
22 alleging discrimination on the basis of sex and age. Docket # 1. Plaintiff seeks declaratory
23 judgment, preliminary and permanent injunction, damages, costs, interest, and attorney’s fees.
24 Thereafter, Plaintiff filed numerous motions requesting extensions of time to amend the
25 complaint, to file certified translations, and to submit documentary evidence, among other
26 issues. See Dockets ## 8-11, 12-17, 22-27. Plaintiff also filed a first amended complaint.
Docket # 4.

On March 10, 2009, this Court issued an order to show cause why this case should not
be dismissed for lack of prosecution, since Plaintiff had not requested that summons be issued.
Docket # 18. In compliance, Plaintiff filed a “Motion to show proper service and Motion to
amend Complaint.” Docket # 21. Therein, Plaintiff posits that the complaint was notified to
Defendants *via* express mail. He also requests that counsel be appointed.

This Court notes that the highly confusing pleadings made in this case do not comply
with FED. R. CIV. P. 8. Rule 8 requires a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the

1 CIVIL NO. 08-1813 (SEC)

2 Page 2

3 plaintiff is entitled to relief. Upon reviewing Plaintiff's complaint, this Court notes that
4 Defendants would not be able to file a coherent responsive pleading, nor properly controvert
5 the facts alleged by Plaintiff. Moreover, per Plaintiff's own admission, this is the third time
6 Plaintiff seeks relief before this court arising from the same nucleus of operative facts, that is,
7 the alleged illegal demotion. See *Manuel Alvarez v. Commissioner of Social Security*, Civil No.
8 00-1280 (JAF) and *Manuel Alvarez v. USA*, Civil No. 03-1225 (SEC). Specifically, on March
9 2, 2000, Plaintiff filed a complaint against the Commissioner of Social Security and the United
10 States of America, alleging sex discrimination, violations of his right to due process under the
11 U.S. Constitution, Title VII, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e *et seq*, the Privacy Act, 5 U.S.C. § 2302, and
12 Law No. 17 of April 22, 1988, P.R. Laws ann. tit. 29, § 155(a) *et seq*. The court dismissed said
13 claims, finding that Plaintiff failed to show that Defendants' proffered legitimate, non-
14 discriminatory reasons for Plaintiff's demotion was actually a pretext for sex discrimination.
15 The court further held that Plaintiff had not properly pled a cause of action under the Privacy
16 Act.

17 On March 4, 2003, Plaintiff filed another complaint against the United States of
18 America, and the acting Chairman for the U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board ("the Board"),
19 alleging violations of his right to due process, a fair trial, and his right to be free from
20 discrimination. *Manuel Alvarez v. USA*, Civil No. 03-1225, Docket # 17. Plaintiff's claims were
21 dismissed with prejudice under the doctrine of *res judicata*. Civil No. 03-1225, Docket # 17.
22 This Court concluded that "all matters related to [Plaintiff's] demotion and the administrative
23 review of said demotion were or could have been adjudicated in the first federal case,"
24 therefore, he could not reassert claims arising from the same facts. Id. This Court also noted that
25 albeit Plaintiff included additional defendants, specifically the acting Chairman for the Board,
26 the government and its officers are in privity for purposes of *res judicata*, even more so,

1 CIVIL NO. 08-1813 (SEC)

Page 3

2 considering that Plaintiff's claims arose from the same facts set forth in the first complaint.
 3 Notwithstanding the foregoing, Plaintiff filed a third complaint against the Commissioner of
 4 Social Security, alleging once again that his demotion was motivated by sex discrimination. He
 5 also avers that he was discriminated against because of his age.

6 Because of the similarity between this and Plaintiff's prior actions, an examination of the
 7 doctrine of *res judicata* is merited. This Circuit's case law has held that “[e]ven without a
 8 motion, ‘a court on notice that it has previously decided an issue may dismiss the action *sua
 9 sponte*, consistent with the *res judicata* policy of avoiding judicial waste.’” Banco Santander
 10 de P.R. v. Lopez-Stubbe (In re Colonial Mortgage Bankers Corp.), 324 F.3d 12, 16 (1st Cir.
 11 2003) (citing Bezanson v. Bayside Enterps., Inc., 922 F.2d 895, 904 (1st Cir. 1990)).¹ The First
 12 Circuit has further held that when the judgment for a prior case is “entered by a federal court
 13 exercising federal question jurisdiction, the applicability of *res judicata* and collateral estoppel
 14 is a matter of federal law.” See Ramallo Bros. Printing, Inc. v. El Dia, Inc., 490 F.3d 86, 89 (1st
 15 Cir. 2007). Under the *res judicata* doctrine, “‘a final judgment on the merits of an action
 16 precludes the parties or their privies from relitigating issues that were or could have been raised
 17 in that action.’” Barreto-Rosa v. Varona-Mendez 393 F. Supp. 2d 122, 126 (D.P.R. 2005); Coors
 18 Brewing Co. v. Mendez-Torres, No. 07-2682, 2009 U.S. App. LEXIS 6638, *10 (1st Cir. 2009)
 19 (citing Perez v. Volvo Car Corp., 247 F.3d 303, 311 (1st Cir. 2001) (citing Allen v. McCurry,
 20 449 U.S. 90, 94 (1980))). The foregoing “prevents plaintiffs from splitting their claims by
 21 providing a strong incentive for them to plead all factually related allegations and attendant

23 ¹ *Sua sponte* dismissal on *res judicata* grounds can only occur when the defense is “definitively
 24 ascertainable from the allegations of the complaint, the documents (if any) incorporated therein, matters of
 25 public record, and other matters of which the court may take judicial notice. The second condition is that the
 26 facts so gleaned must conclusively establish the affirmative defense.” Banco Santander de P.R., 324 F.3d at 16
 (citing Blackstone Realty LLC v. FDIC, 244 F.3d 193, 197 (1st Cir. 2001); LaChapelle v. Berkshire Life Ins.
 Co., 142 F.3d 507, 509 (1st Cir. 1999).

1 CIVIL NO. 08-1813 (SEC)

2 Page 4

3 legal theories for recovery the first time they bring suit." Apparel Art Int'l v. Amertex Enters.,
4 48 F.3d 576, 583 (1st Cir. 1995).

5 To trigger *res judicata*, also known as claim preclusion, there must be "(1) a final
6 judgment on the merits in an earlier suit, (2) sufficient identicity between the causes of action
7 asserted in the earlier and later suits, and (3) sufficient identicity between the parties in the
8 two suits." Coors Brewing, No. 07-2682, 2009 U.S. App. LEXIS 6638 at *10 (citations
9 ommitted); Breneman v. U.S. ex rel. F.A.A., 381 F.3d 33 (1st Cir. 2004) (citing Banco
10 Santander de P.R., 324 F.3d at 15 (internal quotation marks omitted)). There is no controversy
11 as to the fact that a final judgment on the merits was issued in Civil No. 00-1280 (JAF), and
12 Civil No. 03-1225 (SEC). Therefore, the first factor is met.

13 As to the second factor, the First Circuit has held that when two separate suits involve
14 sufficiently identical causes of action, a judgment in an earlier action precludes litigation of
15 claims in a subsequent action. Apparel Art, 48F.3d at 583. This Circuit has adopted the
16 methodology of the Restatement (Second) of Judgments in defining the cause of action for *res*
17 *judicata* purposes. Manego v. Orleans Bd. of Trade, 773 F.2d 1, 5 (1st Cir. 1985). Accordingly,
18 in order to determine the identity of the underlying claims or causes of action, a cause of action
19 is defined as a set of facts which can be characterized as a single transaction or a series of
20 related transactions. Manego, 773 F.2d at 5. As a result, the cause of action is a transaction that
21 is identified by a common nucleus of operative facts. Id. Although a set of facts may give rise
22 to multiple claims based on different legal theories, if the facts form a common nucleus that is
23 identifiable as a transaction or series of related transactions, then those facts represent one cause
24 of action. Id. In order to determine whether a party has advanced claims in multiple litigations
25 which derive from the same nucleus of operative facts, this Court may consider: 1) whether the
26 facts are related in time, space, origin or motivation; 2) whether the facts form a convenient trial

1 CIVIL NO. 08-1813 (SEC)

2 Page 5

3 unit; and 3) whether treating the facts as a unit conforms to the parties' expectations. Apparel
4 Art., 48F.3d at 583. Additionally, in determining whether there is an identity of causes, a court
5 must analyze the object or matter over which the action is being brought. Arroyo v. K-Mart Inc.,
6 81 F. Supp. 2d 301, 306 (D.P.R. 1999). The requirement is that there be an identity of causes,
7 that is, the principal basis or origin of the action. Id. at 307 (citing Lausell Marxuach, 103 P.R.
8 Dec. 533, 536 (1975)).

9 Thus, this Court must first determine whether the facts set forth by Plaintiff in the instant
10 complaint arise from the same nucleus of operative facts as those that were adjudicated by the
11 prior judgments of the district court. Clearly, the two prior suits, and the present complaint arise
12 out of Plaintiff's demotion, that is, from the same nucleus of operative facts. Since the identity
13 of causes requirement does not prevent the *res judicata* doctrine from being applied to a second
14 case simply because the plaintiff alleges a new legal theory in it, the fact that Plaintiff now
15 alleges age discrimination is irrelevant. Id. (Citing Futura Development. v. Centex Corp., 761
16 F.2d 33, 44 (1st Cir. 1985)). He cannot relitigate issues that were, or could have been raised, in
17 the prior action. Since the causes of action of the three suits are identical, the second factor is
18 also satisfied.

19 Finally, this Court must determine whether the defendants in all three cases are identical,
20 or sufficiently in privity, to satisfy the third element. Banco Santander de P.R., 324 F.3d at 17.
21 Generally, “[r]es judicata bars subsequent suits against those who were not party to a prior suit
22 if their interests are closely related to those who were. Such privity exists between government
23 entities and their employees when such employees are sued in their official capacities.” Easley
24 v. Reuss, 247 Fed. Appx. 823, 826 (7th Cir. 2007); U.S. v. Alky Enterprises, Inc., 969 F.2d 1309,
25 1312 (1st Cir. 1992). Upon reviewing the record, this Court finds that Plaintiff's first claim was
26 directed towards the United States, and the Commissioner of Social Security, the second claim

1 CIVIL NO. 08-1813 (SEC)

2 Page 6

3 was filed against the United States, and the Chairman of the Board, and the instant suit is
4 brought against the Commissioner of Social Security, among other defendants. Therefore, the
5 defendants in the first case and the present suit are identical, insofar as both claims were
6 directed at the Commissioner of Social Security. Since the government and its officers are in
7 privity, or closely related, for purposes of *res judicata*, the third element of the *res judicata*
8 doctrine is also satisfied. See Negron-Fuentes v. UPS Supply Chain Solutions, 532 F.3d 1, 10
9 (1st Cir. 2008).

10 Plaintiff's first federal case was dismissed *via* summary judgment because Plaintiff failed
11 to show that Defendants' proffered legitimate, non-discriminatory reasons for Plaintiff's
12 demotion was actually a pretext for sex discrimination. As such, it was properly dismissed on
13 the merits, and Plaintiff did not file an appeal. Plaintiff's second federal case was dismissed
14 under the doctrine of *res judicata* since he sought the same relief against the same defendants,
15 or its privities, based upon the same facts. Once again, the issues and parties raised in the
16 present complaint are identical to the prior actions, where final judgment with prejudice was
17 entered. As previously stated by this Court, all matters related to his demotion and the
18 administrative review of the same were or could have been adjudicated in the first case.
19 Therefore, Plaintiff cannot continue to file complaints based on the same grounds, and against
20 the same defendants when a final judgment has been entered, and he chose not to appeal the
21 same. Based on the foregoing, this Court finds that dismissal on *res judicata* grounds is also
22 appropriate in this case.

23 Based on the foregoing, this Court holds that Plaintiff's complaint is precluded by *res*
24 *judicata*, and as a result, is **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**. His request for the appointment
25 of counsel is **DENIED**. Judgment shall be entered accordingly.

26 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

1 CIVIL NO. 08-1813 (SEC)

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
Page 7

San Juan, Puerto Rico, this 19th day of May, 2009.

*S/*Salvador E. Casellas
Salvador E. Casellas
U.S. District Judge